DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 169 JC 820 032

AUTHOR Story, Sherie
TITLE Washington State Community College Educational Goals Study.
INSTITUTION Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Olympia.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Objectives; State Boards of Education; State Legislation; State Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Trustees; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Community College Goals Inventory

ABSTRACT

During July and August 1981, people responsible for the delivery of community college education in Washington State were administered the Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI), an instrument which lists 110 goal statements and asks respondents to indicate how important each goal is and should be. The survey was administered to members of local boards of trustees, community college administrators and faculty, members and staff of the Washington State Board for Community College Education, and legislative committee members. There was a consensus among all the survey groups as to which of the 20 basic goal areas should be of high priority, i.e., vocational/technical education, general education, developmental/remedial preparation, sense of college community, effective management, and accountability. Vocational/technical education and general education were also ranked as goals that presently are among the highest priorities. The goal area, college community, showed the highest level of difference between existing and desirable priority, with all groups except for the legislators indicating that it should be of high priority, but that it is near the bottom in current emphasis. Goal areas which were felt to be over-emphasized included leisure time education, student and faculty freedom, and adult courses. Comparisons with a similar 1974 survey showed several significant shifts in emphases. Respondent group responses are appended. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211169

WASHINGTON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL GOALS STUDY

Prepared by
Sherie Story
Information Services Division
State Board for Community College Education
Olympia, Washington
October, 1981

JC 820 032

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sherie Story

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

WASHINGTON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EDUCATIONAL GOALS STUDY

A high level of consensus exists among those groups most directly responsible for the delivery of community college education in the state of Washington. They identify the highest institutional priority to be training and upgrading people for jobs, in conjunction with providing general education offerings. They also identify a need to put more emphasis on remedial education, high academic standards, and better internal campus relationships, while de-emphasizing lifelong learning and student services. This report contains the results of a goals survey conducted for Washington community colleges in August of 1981, and discusses some of the implications.

INTRODUCTION

As resources decline, the need to determine priorities becomes particularly important. Accordingly, the State Board for Community College Education, with the assistance of the trustees and presidents' associations, sponsored the administration of the Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI).

The CCGI is an opinion survey developed by the Educational Testing Service in cooperation with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. It has been in use nationally since 1979 and is designed to help community colleges define their educational goals, establish priorities among those goals, and give direction to present and future planning. The CCGI allows the perceptions of different groups to be compared with regard to the amount of importance which "is" and "should be" assigned to given goal areas.

In this case, the CCGI was used to obtain opinions from those people responsible for the delivery of community college education in this state. Administrators, trustees, State Board members and staff, faculty, and members of selected legislative committees were asked to respond to the survey during July and August, 1981.

This report provides the results of the CCGI survey. In addition, public opinion obtained through a statewide survey done in July, 1980, is included where possible to provide for a comparison of those who provide community college services and those who use them.

SURVEY GROUPS

The primary focus of the CCGI survey was on those people responsible for the delivery of community college education. Each of these groups are described below.

Trustees

Surveys were distributed to all 115 members of the 23 local boards of trustees. Eighty-four, or 73%, responded.

Administrators

Surveys were distributed to five administrators at each college and district office. Included were the president, the dean of instruction, the dean of students, the business manager, and a fifth administrator selected by the president. This was a total of 150 surveys of which 138, or 92%, were returned.

State Board & Staff

Surveys were distributed to the seven members of the State Board and the 18 members of the State Board staff's Operations Committee. Of these 25 surveys, 18, or 72%, were returned.

Legislators

Surveys were distributed to all members of the Senate Higher Education, Senate Ways and Means, House Higher Education, House Appropriations/ Education, and House Ways and Means committees. These committees were selected because of their involvement in higher education policy matters and the establishment of the biennial appropriations.

After accounting for duplicate membership, 52 surveys were sent. Of these, 19, or 36%, were returned, as follows:

Senate Higher Education	4
Senate Ways & Means	5
House Higher Education	4
House Education/Appropriations	2
House Ways & Means	4

Faculty

This population was defined to be all full and part-time instructors who taught in Spring Quarter, 1981 (7,795 instructors). A sample of 900 was randomly selected, of which 428 returned surveys, providing more than a 95% confidence level in the validity of the sample.

SURVEY FRAMEWORK

The survey contains 110 individual goal statements. Eighty-two of these are organized into 20 basic goal areas. The remaining 28 individual goal statements were designed by the Educational Testing Service and the SBCCE and are judged to be sufficiently important to warrant individual analysis. The 20 basic goal areas include programs and operations. Program goal areas address curriculum emphasis and kinds of services, while operational goal areas relate to educational processes and the campus climate. The basic goal areas are listed below, and the 28 additional individual goals follow. Complete goal definitions are contained in Appendix A.

PROGRAM	OPERATIONAL
General education	Counseling & advising
Intellectual orientation	Student services
Lifelong learning	Faculty/Staff development
Cultural/aesthetic awareness	Intellectual environment
Personal development	Innovation
Humanism/altruism	College community
Vocational/technical education	Freedom
Developmental/remedial preparation	Accessibility
Community services	Effective management
Social criticism	Accountability

ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUAL GOALS

Adult High School Completion	Community Educ. Programs
Apprentice Training	Evaluation of Faculty & Admin.
Parenting Courses	Leisure Time Education
Courses Through Media	Learning About Foreign Cultures
Day Care Facilities	Local Autonomy
Comprehensiveness	Involving Citizens in Planning
Minority & Disadvantaged Access	Interpreting the College to Citizens
Contracted Funding	Education Relevant to Minorities
Pooling Resources w/Other Agencies	Involving Students/Fac/Trus/Adm. In Policy Setting
Student Financial Aid	High Academic Standards
Campus Attractiveness	Intercollegiate Athletics
New Capital Funding	Education Relevant to Women
Ethnic Mix of Faculty & Staff	Serving as a Cultural Center
Eval.of Student Performance	
Articulation of Voc.Progs. w/High Schools	

Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point scale how important each goal <u>is</u> and how important it <u>should be</u>.

ORGANIZATION OF RESULTS

The analysis of the survey responses is divided into two parts. The first part covers the 20 basic goal areas. The second part covers the 28 additional individual goals designed by ETS and the SBCCE.

For each survey group, the "is" and "should-be" scores are used to rank the basic goal areas, and then the additional goals, in order of importance. These rankings are displayed in two tables that are on pages 4 and 5 of Appendix A. These tables are then used to identify where agreement or disagreement exists regarding priorities and performance either between groups or between what is and what should be.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Twenty Basic Goal Areas

Out of the 20 basic goal areas, there was a high level of consensus among all the survey groups as to six goal areas that should be of high priority. Three of these are programmatic in nature and three are operational:

Top Three Program Goal Areas

- Vocational/Technical Education: *occupational preparation, upgrade, or retraining*
- General Education: *general knowledge, basic competencies, life skills, preparation for advanced work*
- Developmental/Remedial Preparation: *providing developmental programs and assuring competency achievement*

Top Three Operational Goal Areas

- College Community: *open and trusting relationships among faculty, students, and administrators*
- Effective Management: *appropriate involvement, systematic planning and evaluation*
- Accountability: *accounting to funding sources regarding program costs, efficiency, and effectiveness*

Vocational/Technical Education and General Education were also ranked as goals that presently are among the highest priorities, suggesting that these two basic components of the comprehensive community college are receiving the appropriate level of emphasis in Washington State. These two goals are also explicitly cited missions in the Community College Act of 1967. Developmental/Remedial Preparation, only implied as a mission in the 1967 act, is perceived as an area that should be given a higher priority than it currently is. Similarly, high importance and performance rankings were obtained in the 1980 Survey of Public Opinion with regard to both Vocational Education and General Education. (The public was not surveyed with regard to Developmental/Remedial Preparation.)

The goal area, however, which shows the highest level of differences between what is and what should be is an operational one: College Community. This goal is defined as "fostering a climate in which there is a faculty and staff commitment to the goals of the college, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among faculty, students, and administrators." All groups, with the exception of the legislators, indicated that College Community should be a high priority, but ranked it near the bottom in current emphasis. Since the College Community goal area can be considered a measure of morale, it is sobering to think that it has slipped so low on community college campuses. This is a situation that can result from competition for scarce resources and an adversarial climate fostered by collective bargaining.

While wide disparity between what is and what should be is not indicated for the Effective Management and Accountability goal areas, some need for an increased level of emphasis is indicated.

In addition to the above discussion of the six goal areas of highest priority, an outline on page eight groups all twenty of the goal areas according to level of importance and degree of discrepancy between "should be" and "is" rankings.

Twenty-eight Individual Goal Statements

Among the additional individual goal statements, four emerge with generally high priority rankings:

Top Four Additional Goals

- High Academic Standards
- Comprehensiveness
- Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators
- Evaluation of Student Performance

There was unanimous agreement that the top priority goal should be High Academic Standards. Judgments regarding current emphasis in this area varied. Trustee and State Board respondents perceived it already as a top priority. Administrators and faculty gave it a somewhat lower current ranking while legislators ranked it significantly lower. The concern that not enough emphasis is being placed on academic standards may be related to the often voiced legislative concern about "hobby" courses offered by the community colleges.

"Evaluation of Student Performance" received a high "should be" priority ranking from faculty, State Board, and legislators, but not so high from administrators and trustees, although all groups indicated a need for increased emphasis on this goal.

"Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators" was ranked high in the "should be" priorities of all groups, with the exception of the State Board, and was coupled with considerable dissatisfaction regarding the current lack of emphasis in this area.

"Comprehensiveness", or maintenance of a balance between liberal arts, vocational, and general education offerings generally received high "Should-Be" and "Is" ratings from all groups.

Two areas that were identified as currently receiving more emphasis than they should are worthy of mention since they are often viewed as traditional community college goals. These are Accessibility and Lifelong Learning. It could be that this shift, when coupled with a desire for increased emphasis on High Academic Standards and Evaluation of Student Performance, indicates a general movement toward higher quality education with less emphasis on accessibility.

For those items which were included in the public opinion survey, the results were similar. Specifically, the public ranked High School Completion and Apprentice Training high and Courses Through the Media, Site Attractiveness, and Intercollegiate Athletics low.

In addition to those individual goals discussed above, an outline on page nine groups all twenty-eight of the additional goal statements according to level of importance and degree of discrepancy between "should be" and "is" rankings.

LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE PERCEPTIONS

An additional outcome of this study is the high incidence of "over-emphasis" scores assigned to various individual goals by the group of legislative respondents. An "over-emphasis" occurs when on the respective one-to-five scales, the actual performance score is higher than the desired importance score. Such occurrences are relatively rare for this type of survey, yet the legislators assigned a higher "Is" than "Should Be" value to 58 out of the 110 individual goals. Goal areas having the highest degree of "negative discrepancy" (.80 or more) included:

Leisure time education
Student & faculty freedom
Courses for adults of all ages
Intercollegiate Athletics
Attractive buildings & grounds
Policy of open admissions
Student activities programs
Local institutional autonomy

In contrast, among all the other groups, including the public, the only incidence of negative discrepancy greater than .80 was assigned by the State Board group to intercollegiate athletics.

It is important to note that the legislative group was very small - 19 of 147 - and a substantial proportion of those who responded are members of the more conservative budget committees.

1974 GOALS SURVEY

Interestingly, a similar goals survey was conducted among Washington community college trustees, administrators, and faculty in 1974, and some comparisons are noteworthy.

The 1974 study indicated a desire to move toward more emphasis on vocational/technical training and away from academic transfer education, which was cited as being part of the "core" activities of four-year institutions. This would have caused community colleges to be more specialized, less comprehensive institutions. The present study assigns almost equal importance levels to these two educational areas, thus placing a high priority on maintaining comprehensiveness. This could be a reflection of the change in the availability of the four-year college option for students as a result of higher tuition rates and undergraduate enrollment limitations.

In 1974 the faculty indicated that their involvement in the policy formulation process was a low priority. They now identify this as an area where increased emphasis is needed, further substantiating the problems with "College Community" cited earlier.

Evaluation of Student Performance was ranked low in 1974, but high in the present study. Possibly related to this is a drop in priority for student counseling.

The Open Door policy was ranked high in preferred importance in 1974, yet was still perceived to be over-emphasized slightly. By 1981, this goal received a lower priority ranking, reflecting satisfaction with the current level of access to community colleges in contrast to an increasing concern with comprehensiveness, remedial education, and quality of programs.

[1]Gillo, Landerholm and Goldsmith, "Goals and Educational Trends in Community Colleges". Journal for Higher Education, Vol. XLV, No. 7, October, 1974, pages 491-503.

CONCLUSION

Goals currently deemed important for Washington community colleges by respondents to the CCGI survey include establishing and maintaining a comprehensive balance among Vocational/Technical, General, and Remedial Educational programs. This is a shift from seven years ago, when a similar study identified a desire to move away from the General Education area. Accessibility, lifelong learning, student services, and athletics are goals identified as needing de-emphasis.

Changes desired in the college operational areas include much more emphasis on internal relations and some increase in emphasis on effective management practices and accountability to funding sources. A need for more emphasis on maintaining high academic standards and evaluating student performance was also identified.

Significantly, there was a high degree of agreement with regard to goal priorities among all the groups surveyed. However, wide variances in the perceptions of actual importance levels relative to "should be" importance levels occurred only among the legislative responses.

Because of limited resources, colleges will be forced to make preferential choices about what goals are to receive higher priorities than others. Under these circumstances, it remains to be seen whether enough flexibility exists in the community college environment to put into effect the changes in emphasis identified in this study while continuing to maintain a high level of performance in those top priority areas where change is not believed to be desirable.

TWENTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOAL AREAS

IS AND SHOULD-BE COMPARISONS

Using Table 1 on page 4 of Appendix A, the twenty goal areas are grouped below according to level of importance and degree of discrepancy between "should-be" and "is" rankings. These groupings are based on a majority opinion among the five survey groups.

GOAL AREAS THAT SHOULD BE OF HIGH IMPORTANCE AND ARE OF HIGH IMPORTANCE

* * - Vocational/Technical Education
* * - General Education

GOAL AREAS THAT SHOULD BE OF MEDIUM IMPORTANCE AND ARE OF MEDIUM IMPORTANCE

- Intellectual Orientation
- Humanism/Altruism
- Intellectual Environment
- Community Services

GOAL AREAS THAT SHOULD BE OF LOW IMPORTANCE AND ARE OF LOW IMPORTANCE

- Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness
- Social Criticism
- Innovation

GOAL AREAS THAT SHOULD BE OF LOWER IMPORTANCE THAN THEY ARE

- Accessibility
- Freedom
- Student Services
- Counseling & Advising
- Lifelong Learning

GOAL AREAS THAT SHOULD BE OF HIGHER IMPORTANCE THAN THEY ARE

* * - Development/Remedial Preparation
* * - College Community
* * - Effective Management
* * - Accountability
- Faculty & Staff Development
- Personal Development

*One of top six priorities

TWENTY-EIGHT ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUAL GOAL STATEMENTS

IS AND SHOULD-BE COMPARISONS

Using Table 2 on page 5 of Appendix A, the twenty-eight goals are grouped below according to level of importance and degree of discrepancy between "should-be" and "is" rankings. These groupings are based on a majority opinion among the five survey groups.

GOALS THAT SHOULD BE OF HIGH IMPORTANCE AND ARE OF HIGH IMPORTANCE

* - Comprehensiveness

GOALS THAT SHOULD BE OF MEDIUM IMPORTANCE AND ARE OF MEDIUM IMPORTANCE

- Apprentice Training
- Articulation of vocational programs with high schools
- Establish community ed. programs with public schools
- Involve citizens in planning
- Provide education relevant to minorities
- Involve students/faculty/trustees/administrators in policy setting

GOALS THAT SHOULD BE OF LOW IMPORTANCE AND ARE OF LOW IMPORTANCE

- Courses through the media
- Day care facilities
- Leisure time education
- Encourage learning about foreign cultures
- Local autonomy
- Intercollegiate athletics
- Serve as a cultural center

GOALS THAT SHOULD BE OF LOWER IMPORTANCE THAN THEY ARE

- Adult High School Completion
- Courses in parenting through cooperative pre-schools
- Continued access of disadvantaged & minority students
- Student financial aid
- Attractive buildings & grounds
- Ethnic mix of faculty & staff
- Education relevant to women

GOALS THAT SHOULD BE OF HIGHER IMPORTANCE THAN THEY ARE

* - High academic standards
- Pooling resources with other agencies to provide services
* - Evaluation of Student Progress
- Seek external contracted funding
- Seek new capital funding
* - Evaluation of faculty and administrators
- Interpret college to citizens

*One of top four priorities

APPENDIX A

TWENTY GOAL AREA DEFINITIONS

PROGRAMMATIC

General Education:	Acquisition of general knowledge, basic competencies, and life skills; preparation for advanced work.
Intellectual Orientation:	Problem solving and self-directed learning abilities; ability to synthesize knowledge, and openness to new ideas.
Lifelong Learning:	Providing learning opportunities to adults of all ages, and awarding degree credit for non-school experience.
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness:	Appreciation of various art forms, study in the humanities and art beyond requirements, exposure to non-western culture, and participation in artistic activities.
Personal Development:	Identification of personal goals and ways of achieving them, enhancement of self-confidence and open relationships.
Humanism/Altruism:	Respect for diverse cultures, commitment to world peace, an understanding of moral issues and concern for welfare of the community.
Vocational/Technical Education:	Specific occupational programs (such as accounting), programs geared to emerging career fields, updating present job skills, and retraining for new jobs.
Developmental/Remedial Preparation:	Assessing needs, providing developmental programs for different learning rates, evaluating programs and assuring student competency achievement.
Community Services:	Community use of college resources, conducting community forums, working with local agencies, industry, unions, etc. on community problems.
Social Criticism:	Critical evaluation of values, a source of ideas to change and how to change social institution, and working as an institution to effect social changes.

OPERATIONAL

Counseling & Advising:	Career, personal, and academic advising, and job placement service.
Student Services:	Special needs support, comprehensive activities program, financial aid, and health services.

Faculty/Staff Development	Opportunities for professional development, sabbatical leave, and equitable evaluation.
Intellectual Environment:	A college climate rich in intellectual and cultural activities.
Innovation:	Experimentation with new approaches to instruction and student evaluation.
College Community:	A climate of open, amicable, and trusting relationships among faculty, students, and administrators.
Freedom:	Ensuring faculty and student freedom to present and hear controversial viewpoints and to choose their own life styles.
Accessibility:	Costs that are not prohibitive; programs offered in convenient locations; a policy of open admissions; and recruiting students previously denied educational opportunity.
Effective Management:	Appropriate involvement in decision making; systematic planning, and systematic evaluation of all programs.
Accountability:	Using cost criteria in determining programs; concern for efficiency; and accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness.

ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUAL GOAL STATEMENTS
DESIGNED BY EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE AND THE SBCCE

The following individual goal statements were judged to be sufficiently important to warrant adding them as single items to the groups of goal area statements.

DESIGNED BY EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

- Encourage students to learn about foreign cultures.
- Maintain or achieve a large degree of local autonomy in relation to governmental and education agencies.
- Include local citizens in planning college programs.
- Interpret systematically the nature, purpose, and work of the college to local citizens.
- Provide educational experiences, relevant to the interests of minorities.
- Develop arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and trustees can be involved in policy making.
- Seek to maintai high standards of academic performance.
- To excel in intercollegiate athletics.
- To provide educational experiences relevant to the interests of women.
- To serve as a cultural center in the community.

DESIGNED BY THE SBCCE

- To offer adult high school completion classes.
- To offer related training for apprentices in the skilled trades.
- To offer courses in parenting through cooperative pre-schools.
- To offer courses through television, radio, and newspaper.
- To provide day care facilities on campus.
- To maintain a balance between liberal arts, vocational, and general education offerings during a time when resources are limited.
- To establish policies and programs that ensure continued access by disadvantaged and minority students.
- To seek contracted external funding to support courses not eligible for or not adequately funded by state appropriations.
- To pool resources with other public agencies to provide services.
- To provide financial aid for students.
- To provide attractive buildings and grounds.
- To seek major new capital funding for community colleges, such as through a referendum.
- To employ a representative mix of faculty and staff in terms of ethnicity and sex at all levels within the institution.
- To evaluate student progress on the basis of performance compared to pre-established, shared objectives.
- To articulate vocational programs with high schools.
- To cooperate with public schools in establishing a community education program.
- To develop a formal plan for evaluating instructors and administrators.
- To provide courses which educate the student for leisure time activities.

TABLE 1

TWENTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOAL AREAS

RANKS FOR IS AND SHOULD-BE

		FACULTY N=428	ADMINIS-TRATORS N=138	TRUSTEES N=84	SBCCE & STAFF N=18	LEGIS-LATORS N=19	AVERAGE OF GROUP RANKING
PROGRAMMATIC							
General Education	SB	1	3	3	7	1	3
	IS	1	2	2	3	2	2
Intellectual Orientation	SB	4.5	8	7	8	3	7
	IS	9	11.5	13	11	6	11
Lifelong Learning	SB	9	7	8.5	10.5	11.5	9
	IS	3	7	7	5	3	4
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	SB	19	19	19	20	19	19
	IS	18	19	19	18	19	19
Personal Development	SB	10	10	8.5	12	10	11
	IS	12	13	15	19	17	16
Humanism/Altruism	SB	13	16	15	16	15	15
	IS	17	18	18	15	18	18
Vocational/Technical Education	SB	2	1	2	1	2	1
	IS	2	1	1	1	1	1
Development/Remedial Preparation	SB	4.5	4	6	2	6	4
	IS	8	6	5.5	4	7.5	6
Community Services	SB	14	14.5	14	13	16	14
	IS	13	16	14	16.5	11	13.5
Social Criticism	SB	20	20	20	19	20	20
	IS	19	20	20	20	20	20
OPERATIONAL							
Counseling and Advising	SB	11	12	12	10.5	11.5	10
	IS	5	4	9.5	6	9	7
Student Services	SB	18	17	16.5	14	17	18
	IS	10	10	12	7	7.5	10
Faculty/Staff Development	SB	7	9	10	9	9	8
	IS	20	14	9.5	14	13	13.5
Intellectual Environment	SB	12	13	13	15	8	13
	IS	14	15	16	13	15	15
Innovation	SB	17	14.5	18	17	14	16.5
	IS	16	17	17	16.5	16	17
College Community	SB	3	2	1	3	5	2
	IS	15	11.5	11	12	14	12
Freedom	SB	16	18	16.5	18	13	16.5
	IS	6	3	8	8	4	5
Accessibility	SB	15	11	11	5	18	12
	IS	4	5	5.5	2	5	3
Effective Management	SB	6	5	5	6	7	6
	IS	11	9	3	9	10	9
Accountability	SB	8	6	4	4	4	5
	IS	7	8	4	10	12	8

TABLE 1A

TWENTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOAL AREAS

AVERAGE SHOULD-BE AND IS RANKINGS
IN DESCENDING ORDER

	SHOULD-BE		IS
1.	Vocational/Technical Education	1.	Vocational/Technical Education
2.	College Community	2.	General Education
3.	General Education	3.	Accessibility
4.	Development/Remedial Preparation	4.	Lifelong Learning
5.	Accountability	5.	Freedom
6.	Effective Management	6.	Development/Remedial Preparation
7.	Intellectual Orientation	7.	Counseling and Advising
8.	Faculty/Staff Development	8.	Accountability
9.	Lifelong Learning	9.	Effective Management
10.	Counseling and Advising	10.	Student Services
11.	Personal Development	11.	Intellectual Orientation
12.	Accessibility	12.	College Community
13.	Intellectual Environment	13.5	Faculty/Staff Development
14.	Community Services	13.5	Community Services
15.	Humanism/Altruism	15.	Intellectual Environment
16.5	Freedom	16.	Personal Development
16.5	Innovation	17.	Innovation
18.	Student Services	18.	Humanism/Altruism
19.	Cultural Aesthetic Awareness	19.	Cultural Aesthetic Awareness
20.	Social Criticism	20.	Social Criticism

TABLE 2

TWENTY-EIGHT ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUAL GOAL STATEMENTS

RANKS FOR IS AND SHOULD-BE

		FACULTY N=428	ADMINIS-TRATORS N=138	TRUSTEES N=84	SBCCE & STAFF N=18	LEGIS-LATORS N=19	AVERAGE OF GROUP RANKING
Adult High School Completion	SB	13	12	10	2	7.5	6
	IS	2	4	3	4	1	2
Apprentice Training	SB	8	17	9	8	5	7
	IS	8	9	9	8	6	8
Parenting Courses	SB	24	24.5	23	20.5	24	23.5
	IS	10	8	12.5	5	20	10
Courses thru Media	SB	26	26	26	25	25	26
	IS	26	25	23	26.5	28	27
Day Care Facilities	SB	21	27	25	22	21	23.5
	IS	15	28	22	23.5	26	24
Comprehensiveness	SB	2	2	3.5	3.25	6	2
	IS	4	2	2	1.33	2.33	1
Minority & Disad-vantaged Access	SB	14	8.33	3.5	3.25	10.5	11
	IS	1	3	12.5	6	2.33	4
Seek Contracted Funding	SB	9	14.5	5	11.5	10.5	10
	IS	16.5	22	8	13.5	7	13
Pool Resources With Other Agencies	SB	10	16	15	11.5	7.5	20
	IS	25	23	21	23.5	25	25
Student Financial Aid	SB	15	6.5	16	9	12	12
	IS	3	1	4	7	5	3
Attractive Campus	SB	20	13	18.5	24	17	16
	IS	5	6	11	9.5	2.33	6
Seek New Capital Funding	SB	16	3	17	17	22	14
	IS	24	20	24	9.5	21.5	21
Ethnic Mix of Faculty & Staff	SB	23	20	21	19	15	18
	IS	11.5	11	15	21.5	8.5	14
Evaluation of Student Performance	SB	5	8.33	14	3.25	3	5
	IS	11.5	16	16.5	20	17.33	17
Articulation of Voc. Progs. w/High Schools	SB	7	7	12.5	14	4	9
	IS	8	14	16.5	25	8.5	15
Community Ed. Progs. w/Public Schools	SB	12	21	11	16	13	13
	IS	21	21	20	21.5	17.33	22
Evaluation of Faculty & Administrators	SB	6	4	2	10	2	3
	IS	13	15	7	17	12.2	12
Leisure Time Ed.	SB	27	24.5	27	26	27	27
	IS	23	24	26	19	12.2	23
Encourage Learning About Foreign Cultures	SB	22	23	24	27	19	22
	IS	28	27	28	28	24	28
Local Autonomy	SB	17.5	14.5	22	23	26	19
	IS	22	17	25	1.33	21.5	17
Involve Citizens In Planning	SB	4	6	6.5	3.25	9	4
	IS	9	7	6	11.5	10.5	8
Interpret College To Citizens	SB	11	5	6.5	7	16	21
	IS	16.5	13	14	26.5	23	19
Education Relevant To Minorities	SB	14	22	20	18	23	17
	IS	14	18.5	18	13.5	12.2	15
Involve Students/Fac/ Trus/Adm in Policy Setting	SB	3	8.33	8	15	14	8
	IS	19	10	5	16	12.2	10
High Academic Standards	SB	1	1	1	1	1	1
	IS	7	5	1	1.5	12.2	5
Intercollegiate Athletics	SB	28	28	28	28	28	28
	IS	27	26	27	18	27	26
Education Relevant To Women	SB	17.5	18	12.5	13	18	15
	IS	6	12	10	1.33	10.5	7
Serve as Cultural Center	SB	19	19	18.5	20.5	20	25
	IS	20	18.5	19	15	17.33	19

TABLE 2A

TWENTY-EIGHT ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUAL GOAL STATEMENTS

AVERAGE SHOULD-BE AND IS RANKINGS
IN DESCENDING ORDER

	SHOULD-BE		IS
1.	High Academic Standards	1.	Comprehensiveness
2.	Comprehensiveness	2.	Adult High School Completion
3.	Eval. of Faculty & Administrators	3.	Student Financial Aid
4.	Involve Citizens in Planning	4.	Minority & Disadvantaged Access
5.	Eval. of Student Performance	5.	High Academic Standards
6.	Adult High School Completion	6.	Attractive Campus
7.	Apprentice Training	7.	Education Relevant to Women
8.	Involve Stu/Fac/Trus/Adm in Policy Setting	8.	Apprentice Training
9.	Articulation of Voc Progs With High Schools	9.	Involve Citizens in Planning
10.	Seek Contracted Funding	10.	Parenting Courses
11.	Minority & Disadvantaged Acess	11.	Involve Stu/Fac/Trus/Adm in Policy Setting
12.	Student Financial Aid	12.	Eval. of Faculty & Administrators
13.	Community Ed Progs w/Public Schools	13.	Seek Contracted Funding
14.	Seek New Capital Funding	14.	Ethnic Mix of Faculty & Staff
15.	Education Relevant to Women	15.	Articulation of Voc Progs With High Schools
16.	Attractive Campus	16.	Education Relevant to Minorities
17.	Education Relevant to Minorities	17.	Eval. of Student Performance
18.	Ethnic Mix of Faculty & Staff	18.	Local Autonomy
19.	Local Autonomy	19.	Serve as a Cultural Center
20.	Pool Resources w/Other Agencies	20.	Interpret College to Citizens
21.	Interpret College to Citizens	21.	Seek New Capital Funding
22.	Encourage Learning About Foreign Cultures	22.	Community Ed Progs w/Public Schools
23.5	Parenting Courses	23.	Leisure Time Education
23.5	Day Care Facilities	24.	Day Care Facilities
25.	Serve as a Cultural Center	25.	Pool Resources w/Other Agencies
26.	Courses thru the Media	26.	Intercollegiate Athletics
27.	Leisure Time Education	27.	Courses thru the Media
28.	Intercollegiate Athletics	28.	Encourage Learning About Foreign Cultures